

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vinginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/427,968	10/27/1999	DAVID P. COOK	26796-2	4007	
27683	7590 07/23/2003				
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100 DALLAS, TX 75202			EXAMI	• WORJLOH, JALATEE	
			- WORJLOH,		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3621		
			DATE MAILED: 07/23/2003	DATE MAILED: 07/23/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Addison Addison	09/427,968	COOK, DAVID P.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jalatee Worjloh	3621				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 24 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10.⊠ Other: <i>Further, claims</i> 6-9, 11-15, and 19-36 are pending.						





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claim 13 does not overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 Rejection; that is, the claims are directed to a process that does nothing more than manipulate an abstract idea. There is no practical application in the technological arts. All that is necessary to make a sequence of operational steps a statutory process within 35 U.S.C. 101 is that it be in the technological arts so as to be in consonance with the Constitutional purpose to promote the progress of "useful arts." In re is that it be in the technological arts so as to be in consonance with the Constitutional purpose to promote the progress of "useful arts." In re Musgrave, 431 F.2d 882, 167 USPQ 280 (CCPA 1970). Also, a claim is limited to a practical application when the method, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible and useful result: i.e. the method recites a step or act of producing something that is concrete, tangible and useful. See AT&T v. Excel Communications Inc., 172 F.3d at 1358, 50 USPQ2dat 1452. Please specify the type of node: e.g. "computing node.

As per claims 19-36, Applicant argues, "Talati and Linehan are not properly combinable, since, if combined their intended function is destroyed". Also, Applicant explains that Talati et al. do not utilize digital signatures in their transaction; whereas, Linehan uses digital signatures in order to function. The examiner disagrees; Talati et al. dislcose utilizing digital signatures for transaction validation/authentication (see col. 5, lines 33-36). Therefore, combining Talati et al. with Linehan will not damaged their "intended functions".

JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600